



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/866,707	05/30/2001	Dwane Bert Benson	011525-269	6041
7590	02.26.2003			
Regis E. Slutter BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P. P.O. Box 1404 Alexandria, VA 22313-1404			EXAMINER CORBIN, ARTHUR L	
		ART UNIT 1761	PAPER NUMBER	
		DATE MAILED: 02/26/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.	09/866,707	Applicant(s)	BENSON ET AL	
Examiner	ARTHUR L. CORBIN		Group Art Unit	1761

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1-6-03

This action is **FINAL**.

Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above claim(s) 5 & 6 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

Claim(s) 1-4 is/are allowed.

Claim(s) is/are rejected.

Claim(s) is/are objected to.

Claim(s) are subject to restriction or election requirement

### Application Papers

The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is  approved  disapproved.

The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner

The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d).

All  Some\*  None of the:

Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.

Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received  
in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

### Attachment(s)

Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_  Interview Summary, PTO-413

Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892  Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948  Other \_\_\_\_\_

## Office Action Summary

1. Claims 5-6 stand withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in Paper No. 7.

Applicant's transvers<sup>o</sup> has been considered but is not convincing since the apparatus does not know what material is being processed therein.

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-4 are indefinite in not reciting the sequence in which the heating and freezing steps occur. Correction is required without new matter.

4. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: There is no antecedent basis in the spec. for freezing the heated potato patty (claims 1-4).

5. Claims 1-4 are objected to because of the following informalities: In claims 1 and 3, line 2 "in" should be changed to "with". Appropriate correction is required.

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 1761

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-4 are ██████████ rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Biegel et al<sup>(cols. 8-9)</sup> in view of Taylor et al<sup>or</sup> Kester et al.

Biegel et al discloses frying potato patties in hot oil at 350<sup>0</sup> F █████ 380<sup>0</sup> F for 85-105 seconds, draining excess oil, heating in a convention oven or a radiant heat oven at 475<sup>0</sup> F for 180 seconds and then freezing. It would have been obvious to substitute a hot air im████ment oven for the convention or radiant heat oven in Biegel et al since each of these oven<sup>s</sup> is used alternatively to heat hot oil coated potato strips, as evidenced by Taylor et al (cols. 8-9), or since a convention oven and hot air █████<sup>impergament</sup> oven are used alternatively to oil coated potato strips, as evidenced by Kester et al (Abstract and cols. 1 and 4). The time limitation in claims 2 and 4 is merely preferred and is not critical.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arthur Corbin whose telephone number is (703) 308-3850. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday--Friday from 10 a.m. to 7:30 p.m. and on alternate Mondays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on (703) 308-3959. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 305-7115 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

A. Corbin/dh  
February 21, 2003

  
ARTHUR L. CORBIN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
2-24-03